

**OCEAN BEACH MEDICAL GROUP**

**1947 Cable Street**

**San Diego, CA 92107**

[paradocs2@cox.net](mailto:paradocs2@cox.net)

March 19, 2006

TO: Councilwoman Frye  
Mission Bay TAC  
SCS Engineers

FROM: Jeoffry B. Gordon, MD, MPH

SUBJECT: Where Do We Go From Here

Dear Colleagues,

I have had an opportunity to review the TAC comments on the Draft Report and SCS's responses and this has prompted me to make the following observations:

First, in follow up to John Field's important review of TAC history, I would like to share with you all - since most of you do not know me personally - that I was not an original member of the TAC. As a community member and a physician with some modicum of technical expertise I was put forward to participate by other community activists. I have over 40 years experience as a community advocacy at the local, state, and national level for social justice causes, usually, but not always, health related. Since my appointment I have diligently participated in the whole TAC process, especially importantly in the selection of SCS Engineers as our contractor.

I dwell on my *bone fides* primarily because I find the comments of Mission Bay Toxic Clean Up to be unduly provocative and inappropriate. The representatives of this organization have been with us throughout this long 3 years; had unfettered opportunities to raise all their issues; and received repeated responses by the TAC, city staff, and our contractor. They have no rational reason to bring up the same details and issues once again. The whole process was closely supervised by us in the full light of day. SCS Engineers is our contractor and not a tool of some opposing bureaucracy, government agency, corporation, or polluting devils. As a community physician and user of Mission Bay for water sports I was initially more than casually concerned about the possible harm and disease due to the toxic pollutants. I had reviewed the extraordinarily complete and competent review of the past surveys of the area done by community volunteers and agreed that they could not be depended upon. SCS Engineers has an excellent reputation, integrity, scientific expertise, technical competence, a good track record and they were working for no one but us. In fact, I am of the opinion that they did an excellent job within the parameters and adequate budget WE set for them. I think we can full trust in their credibility. **THEY FOUND NO SMOKING GUN.**

In the same vein, I would respect Hiram Sarabia and David Huntley's technical concerns and SCS should and has responded to them. Personally I think these critiques should be viewed in the context of trusting SCS's scientific integrity and supporting it. The length and depth of

their Draft Report is in my opinion extraordinary. In the end there are and will surely be issues and areas of exploration that may have been overlooked or not included. I believe these should all be raised within the context that SCS Engineers made a competent and trustworthy study. They do not detract from the clear conclusion that no threatening contemporary evidence of past pollution was found.

Next I would observe that SCS Engineers has probably done us a great service by refusing to discuss or elaborate on future actions or policy issues. I can see now that there are no technical nor scientific answers to David's "Hot Button" issues. The answers will remain uncertain and they should be dealt with as policy issues on the basis of whatever evidence is before us. Now, more than ever, clearly our responsibility is to define and put forward an intelligent discussion rather than definitive answers in this area. In this context, in my opinion, we will need to ask for more initiative and active support by City staff and officials. TAC has the future responsibility to make firm and clear recommendations for future policy and usage of this area of Mission Bay Park. I will be available to participate in this process.

Finally, I want to tell you all I am totally frustrated with how long and dribbling the wrap up of the Report has become. Surely the point by point commentary by SCS Engineers is standard operating procedure in matters of this sort and I guess we can now respond, but how many iterations of this process must we go through? In my opinion our collective observations and suggestions have been helpful and will improve the Report. Nonetheless, they are basically all peripheral to the basic data that show there is no major current danger to the public. After a three month hiatus, I am disappointed to get SCS responses to suggestions that "This section will be rewritten," or "This statement will be revised," or "A paraphrased version of your proposed text will be added." By now I would think we would have the actual new texts to review. I would like to have a compendium of all proposed revised and expanded texts and pages of the Report as well as a draft Executive Summary BEFORE WE MEET AGAIN. Again this dialogue has clarified for me that we cannot and should not depend on our consultants to make policy conclusions. That is our responsibility and we must implement it once the Report is finalized.